Remarks

It is noted that Claims 1-7 have been allowed.

Claim 8 was rejected as depending from itself. It has been amended in line 1 to depend from claim 7 and should now satisfy the requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 9 was rejected on *Eckert*, Patent No. 4,022,517. This claim has been amended and is now believed to clearly distinguish over such patent. The claim brings out that the dunnage has "a plastic upwardly facing product receiving and supporting portion and a downwardly facing rigidifying plastic portion extending along beneath the product receiving portion". In addition, Claim 9 has been amended to bring out that the "dunnage supports [are] attached to side walls of the box at opposite ends of the dunnage for removably receiving the dunnage and supporting the same out of contact with superjacent or subjacent layers of the product". This enables the workman in, for example, an automotive assembly plant, working on the line, to remove product from the box in the top layer of the products and when the top layer is exhausted, to remove the dunnage for access to the next subjacent layer whereby each of the layers of product in the box may be removed for construction of an automobile moving down the assembly line. The *Eckert* structure does not suggest this kind of device and it is submitted that Claim 9 as now amended clearly patentably distinguishes over *Eckert* or any other reference and therefore allowance of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-13, which depend from Claim 9, should also now be allowable.

New Claim 14 has been added based on the Examiner's analysis distinguishing the novelty of Applicants' development over the prior art as set forth in the fourth paragraph on Page 3 of the Official Action. For the very reasons set forth by the Examiner, the claim is believed to clearly patentably distinguish over the art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Atty Dkt No. CPC 0117 PUS

S/N: 10/619,666 Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2004

It is believed this application is now in condition for formal allowance and such action is requested. Should the Examiner care to discuss any aspect of the application with the undersigned, such would be certainly welcome.

Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS RICHARD KALTZ, JR. DONNA LOU LUCAS

Ralph M. Burton

Reg. No. 17,748

Attorney for Applicants

Date: November 1, 2004

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351